



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER



April 8, 2011

Rep. Gerald M. Fox, Co-Chairman
Sen. Eric D. Coleman, Co-Chairman
Judiciary Committee
Legislative Office Building
Hartford, CT 06106

**SB 1234 AN ACT CONCERNING NONDISCLOSURE OF RESIDENTIAL
ADDRESSES OF CERTAIN PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES**

The Department of Public Safety supports this bill.

This proposed bill would clarify that the residential addresses of certain public officials and employees shall not be disclosed under any provision of the general statutes. The addresses of these public officials are protected from public disclosure pursuant to the freedom of information act in Conn. Gen. Stat. § 1-217, which protects from public disclosure by any public agency the residential addresses of twelve different groups of government employees whom the legislature determined required this critical protection as a function of the work that they do for the citizens of this state. Among others, the statute protects law enforcement officers, state and federal judges, prosecutors and public defenders, and employees of the Department of Children and Families and the Department of Correction. There is a compelling public policy justification for providing this critical statutory protection for these public servants. Simply because of the work that they do for the citizens of this state, these dedicated state and federal officers and employees, and their families, risk becoming the target of criminal revenge.

The protections of Conn. Gen. Stat. § 1-217, could be somewhat illusory, however, as the residential address of any of the protected parties might be ascertained from the



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER



local City or Town Hall in the tax assessors or voter registrar's records. These addresses could be available to violent felons, for example, who could look up the home address of the police officer that arrested them, the assistant state's attorney that prosecuted them, the public defender who represented them, the judge that sentenced them, the correction officer who guards them, the parole board members who denied the criminal's request for parole, and the DCF worker that was forced to remove their children from their home.

While there is no perfect way to completely protect the residential addresses of these government employees engaged in sensitive work, the common sense protection enacted by the legislature to prevent public agencies from distributing their residential addresses to any who may ask should be made crystal clear.

This change should have no effect on the ability of town assessors and registrars to do their jobs – their official lists would remain complete and unredacted. It is only publicly disclosed records from which residential addresses are to be removed. It should also be noted that the number of residential addresses which are to be protected is small. The administrative burden would be small while the interest in safety of our employees in highly sensitive positions, and their families, is of critical importance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Reuben F. Bradford".

Reuben F. Bradford
COMMISSIONER